



GENESEE STAFF COUNCIL

Meeting Agenda: March 8, 2024

Location: School of Nursing, Room 4w506/508

8:45 – 9:00AM – Breakfast

9:00 – 9:10 AM – Welcome and Housekeeping

- Group Norms
- Approval of January meeting minutes

9:10 – 9:30 AM – GSC language—proposed changes

9:30 – 9:35 AM – Communications Committee request for annual report information (Leslie Collison and Andria Mutrie)

9:35 – 10:10 AM – Committee breakout session

10:10 – 10:15 AM – CPM discussion prep

10:15 – 10:30 AM – Break

10:30 – 11:30 AM – CPM Feedback discussion with Kathy Gallucci and Dan Salamone

11:30 – 11:45 AM – Wrap-Up

- Co-Chair Updates
- District updates
- Matters arising
- Summary, wrap up, and takeaways
- Good news

Attendees: Co-Chair Jane Bryant, Co-Chair Jon Powers, Melinda Adelman, Chennel Anderson, Laura Ballou, Rachel Bills, Kristi Brock, Jamie Brown, Amanda Carter, Karen Cera, Lindsay Chasse, Marisa Chiodo, Leslie Collison, Kris Condello, Jazmin Dunham, Maria Fagnano, Scott Fearing, Dylan George, Mary Hallinan, Shari Hofmann, Arian Horbovetz, Austin Jackson, Charles LaBrake, Aaron Landcastle, David Lanni, Hannah McClow, Darrin Meszler, Andria Mutrie, Michael Occhino, Ted Pagano, Katie Papas, Brenda Pitoni, Nate Ridley, Lauren Sageer, Marc Seigfred, Amanda Sharpe, Sarah Siddiqui, Ashley Smith, Lisa Smith, Molly Snyder, Jessica Syposs, Dan Watts, Joe Williams, Paul Wlosinski

Guests: Kathy Gallucci, Josh Lehman, Dan Salamone

Co-Chair Jon Powers welcomed the representatives and reviewed the day's agenda and group norms. Council Secretary Karen Cera presented the February meeting minutes for approval. The minutes were approved by the present Council members.

Jon Powers: Welcome Dylan George, our new Simon School of Business Representative, replacing Heidi Mergenthaler who left for a new position last month. Dylan will be a part of the engagement subcommittee. Kris Condello will be moving into a new role in the AS&E Dean's Office, but she has agreed to stay on as ex officio for the rest of this term. She is planning to step back from her role on the Engagement Committee due to the new position.

GSC Language

Jane Bryant: We sent some suggested GSC language changes ahead of the meeting. We will review and discuss all the proposed changes in this meeting. For the mission statement change, we will have to vote on that change at our next meeting since it is in the Bylaws. So we propose updating the mission to “*The mission of the Genesee Staff Council is to facilitate active and direct communication between University staff and senior administration at the University of Rochester. Our goal is to serve as an advisory board on matters that affect the staff we represent and create forums for input.*”

Jane Bryant: Alongside the mission, our ‘Who we are’ statement will say “*The Genesee Staff Council is comprised of elected staff representatives and represents [approximate number] University of Rochester staff. The Council was created in 2019 with 11 districts, and in 2023 we expanded to 15 districts. We aim to grow to represent all staff at the University of Rochester. Learn more about our structure and activities here.*”

Jane Bryant: We have consolidated our ‘responsibilities of the Genesee Staff Council’ section, and added the word ‘advocate,’:

- *Advocate for staff in University decisions*
- *Encourage staff engagement with the council, each other, and leadership*
- *Provide input on policies and procedures that pertain to or affect staff*
- *Recommend staff members to serve on important institutional committees*

Comment: A grammar suggestion, I think it would be better to say ‘is composed of elected staff’ instead of ‘is comprised of.’

Dan Watts: Do we say something about what a district is?

Jane Bryant: That information will be linked elsewhere.

Kristi Brock: We could add the word ‘district’ before ‘structure’ in ‘learn more about our structure.’

Comment: I think this is headed in a much better direction than it was before, so thank you for listening to our input. One comment, that approximate number of staff we represent could use more context. For example, what percentage of total staff is that?

Ashley Smith: I would suggest deleting the ‘important’ before ‘important institutional

committees,” as it’s rather subjective.

Brenda Pitoni: On the bottom of who we are, from a web design perspective, I would say “learn more about our structure and activities.” And have ‘structure and activities’ be the link, without the ‘here.’

Karen Cera: Instead of ‘important institutional committees,’ maybe say ‘several institutional committees,’ or ‘select institutional committees.’

Marc Seigfred: ‘Relevant institutional committees.’

Jane Bryant: We will take some time to look at these suggestions. And our next steps after getting this solidified is looking at how we define our static and annual goals and priorities. We hope to do that by our next election cycle.

Communications Committee Request

Leslie Collison: I’m one of the Co-Chairs of the Communications Committee. Our structure for this year’s annual report will look similar to last year’s. For the subcommittees, we are thinking of highlighting key achievements for this past year (since the last annual report), or plans and initiatives for this coming year. We ask that each committee discuss and put together those items today. Last year, the annual report went out in February. We’re pushing it back this year, our goal is to have a final draft by May 1. So we would like to get information from committees by the end of this month so we can put a draft together.

Jon Powers: The purpose of the annual report is to update the University community on what we’re doing.

Karen Cera: We are now going into committee breakout groups. After you discuss the annual report info, everyone should check in with their committees, and discuss whether things are running smoothly, whether things could be going better, etc. Have those open discussions, and if you’re not comfortable discussing issues within your group, feel free to come to me or the Co-Chairs with your concerns.

Committee Report-Outs

Kris Condello: My only thought is that it takes a while to get going with the new committees. We need to find a better way to transition or get the committee momentum going earlier.

Arian Horbovetz: For the Accessibility Committee, one of the challenges we’ve faced is how to address such a broad idea of “accessibility,” I think we’ve made some good progress so far, but it’s a tough thing.

Laura Ballou: Our committee has run into the same problem. “Special Projects” feels so big, so we are choosing a few things to focus on. We think will work out better for us to try and select three projects or so, rather than trying to tackle everything.

Jon Powers: As you’re working through prioritizing your committee work, feel free to check

win with Karen or the Co-Chairs. The Executive Committee is available as a resource as you're working through these issues.

CPM Discussion Prep

Jon Powers: HR did send out a message this morning relevant to CPM, so please do check that out before our conversation with Kathy and Dan. If you are a collective bargaining employee, you did not get that email, so let me know so I can share it with you.

Jane Bryant: Kathy Gallucci is sick today, so Dan Salamone and Josh Lehman will be joining us. Kathy will join us via Zoom. They will go over our recommendations, and the plan for how they will be addressing those, as well as timelines. We will have time to talk about other issues you've heard from your constituents that may not have been addressed in the recommendations.

Jon Powers: If you have not yet completed the Expansion Evaluation survey, please be sure to do so.

CPM Discussion

Dan Salamone and Josh Lehman joined the GSC at the in-person meeting, and Kathy Gallucci joined us via Zoom.

Dan Salamone: Thank you all for sharing your recommendations and feedback. We looked at this feedback in categories: job details (specifically appeals), structural details, and communications. Specifically with job details, I know there was some confusion around the next phase of the job catalog, which will go live on March 18. That will include job summaries, requirements, job skills and knowledge, etc. We did add over 200 new job classifications in this structure. The other piece of this is the job leveling itself. Some of the feedback we've received is asking for us to publish the job leveling guides. We are working with our steering committee right now to re-evaluate that piece of it, and working out whether we will be able to share that full leveling guide for the institution. We have to make sure that we're able to provide context around the leveling. But as we launch the job catalog, there is differentiation between levels within these job descriptions that will help.

Dan Salamone: We're working to get a section on the CPM website live with appeals information, so that it's not only available to managers. The timeline for appeals is essentially going away, we will work on appeals on an ongoing basis. The final version of what that will look like is in approval right now, so sometime in the next few weeks. We do understand that not everyone feels that their manager is the best advocate for them, and so we are working to make clear alternative paths for appeals, such as going to the HR Business Partner. There are also other points of escalation, so we'll make sure to have that information available.

Comment: Sometimes the HR Business Partner position for an area is vacant, and it's not clear to the area who they should go to.

Josh Lehman: We can make that clear on the website.

Dan Salamone: Another thing that came up is the idea of employees being able to submit their own appeals. I think that's where we'll really have to lean on the HRBP for support, as they have a broader understanding of the organization. Candidly, the appeals are taking more time than expected due to the diligence the compensation team is putting into them. As we launch the site, we are working to build some transparency around how many appeals are currently in process, and what the turn-around time is. Another important piece of feedback we received is to notify staff of where their appeal is in the process, so we're working to automate some of the pieces to notify staff where their appeal currently sits in the process. The GSC also recommended that the CPM team provide a date when wage compression will be addressed. That message went out this morning. The issue will be addressed periodically through July of 2026.

Comment: I was not the one who initiated my own appeal, and I want to stress the importance of communications through this process. I never received any notices throughout the process as the employee. The only reason I knew anything is because someone came and talked to me in person.

Comment: Transparency was very good in the beginning of the process, but it has been garbage since then. No one knows what's going on, and plenty of people are angry. In September 2023, a question was posed to Kathy asking if HR support has been ramped up to deal with this, and the answer was essentially 'no.' I don't think that's good enough. I feel that this process has been more reactive instead of proactive. Transparent timelines are key. I have people who lost their comp time and don't understand what happened.

Kathy Gallucci: I would like to thank you for being so candid. Part of the reason I answered that way, is that we talked about the responsibility of the leaders. I think part of the issue is that every structure in our university is different. In listening to you, we understand where the fail points are and we can respond to them. I would love for us to have been more proactive in the issues you bring up, but hearing this feedback allows us to address them now. You have our commitment that we are taking your feedback and continuing to do this work.

Comment: Thank you, I really appreciate that response and appreciate the transparency. The crux of where this has fallen apart for me, is with the structure. The way you answered that question in September was that we needed the departments to take on this work and do their due diligence. But to me, there was no senior leadership enforcement. I appreciate that this is a really hard thing to manage within the university. I know that departments manage things differently, but with all due respect, that has to be dealt with. We cannot let the leaders of the departments continue to do the same things that got us here in the first place.

Kathy Gallucci: I want to be fair to our senior leaders, I do think they're working very hard to address these issues. We have almost an entirely new leadership team under Sarah Mangelsdorf. We are a massive organization, and I can see from your perspective how it's not going fast enough, but it's an incredibly big ship to turn. I want to take accountability for something, we had a lot of conversations about the timeline for CPM and Dan even warned me that the timeline was very tight. I said we had promised our employees that we would deliver this structure, and I did not want to tell the staff that it was going to take 18 months longer. The things that we didn't find out in the implementation process, we're

finding out from you. For example, we had no visibility into your business titles, only into your HRMS title. Some departments gave us that information, other areas didn't.

Comment: The level of leadership that did not provide that information to you, how are they being held accountable for not participating? I think that's the level of accountability we're looking for.

Comment: I appreciate the comment about senior leadership being supportive, and I agree. But the reason why I said its senior leadership's problem, is because this issue you brought up of directors and departments not participating in this university initiative, is a performance issue. Senior leadership needs to hold them accountable.

Kathy Gallucci: We have provided where things have fallen down from a leadership standpoint, and we have followed up on that. I can't get into specifics, and I'm not going to make excuses. President Mangelsdorf has been a tremendous support for this project.

Comment: I'm a division inside a department, the department takes their time getting it to us, and then asks us to turn it around in 24 hours.

Comment: We were a test group when CPM came out, and my manager is very transparent with us about everything. I have seen the documents that we have produced as a group. For me, there was 3-4 iterations. The frustration of watching people I work with on the cusp of leaving despite supportive management has been frustrating. The job titles are not satisfactory, appeals timelines are being dropped, and emails to the CPM team aren't being answered. Communicating realistically about when people can expect to hear back on the CPM website would be helpful.

Dan Salamone: To that comment, I'm meeting with both the leaders in your group next week. We are aware of the situation you are referring to, and I am following up on that.

Comment: First I just want to say thank you to you and Kathy. You have pretty much addressed all the things that we brought up to you a couple of weeks ago in the GSC Executive Committee meeting. I'm one of the employees getting shuffled. There's a restructuring in my department, is that related to CPM?

Dan Salamone: Not that I'm aware of.

Comment: One thing that has not been considered is student employees. How is supervision of student employees factored in?

Dan Salamone: Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, the way we identify a supervisor from an exemption standpoint is someone with 2 or more direct reports that are regular employees as opposed to student employees. I want to understand more about the student piece as we move forward. Maybe we can follow up offline about that.

Comment: We have well over 200 student employees, and we have advanced that concern for months to the CPM team. Student employees are getting sick and vacation time. We can't operate without these critical student workers.

Comment: We also have student workers who are not called student workers, because it's part of their graduate award. I supervise 50 TA's that are not included in our system.

Comment: Do you have an idea in mind of how soon a conversation about student employment might be able to start?

Dan Salamone: I would like to understand the circumstance more, but we can start that conversation sooner rather than later, probably in the Spring to start the ball rolling.

Comment: Student employment has a steering committee at the University, perhaps they could be used as a resource.

Comment: Do you have any plans to share any details about the benchmarking process or findings?

Dan Salamone: We worked with an external partner on this project, and this firm had worked with other universities on similar processes. They shared that decentralization is pretty common, which leads to some of the gaps that we've seen. Because of some of the external partners we work with on salary survey data and benchmarking, we are limited in what we can share.

Kathy Gallucci: We don't currently have a recruitment data system. So we don't have a way to track when people are declining offers due to salary. We will have that ability with the implementation of Workday.

Comment: If there could be a basic summary of the benchmarking process shared, that would be helpful. Also, we understand that there is a deadline for appeals for the first round, so we suggest that you make that information more clear to staff.

Comment: There was an RCAG meeting where they said that appeals approved in this stage will be retroactive, and I don't believe that's something that's been shared broadly.

Dan Salamone: There are some instances where an appeal leads to someone being below the minimum of where they will end up, so we are clear with HR that once the appeal is complete, the title and minimum are applied retroactively to the date when the appeal was made.

Kathy Gallucci: We do have deadlines and structure, but if we've missed something we will continually review any issues. Our intention is to continue to talk to you and have these conversations, and to continually work toward resolutions. This process is complicated, and we've had an awful lot of people who have done a lot of work, including our staff.

Jon Powers: As far as next steps, we will probably take everything discussed today and summarize it and pass it along to you for review before we communicate anything to our districts and constituents. Thank you all for coming, we appreciate your time.

Wrap-Up

Jane Bryant: Unfortunately, after July 1 I will no longer be able to stay on as Co-Chair of

the Council due to my regular job. So we will be talking about an election or a succession plan with Internal Affairs.

Jon Powers: You may have heard the announcement about the Teams update. As of today, you can update to the new client. If you have any questions, you're welcome to reach out to Molly Snyder for help with Teams. A parking/transportation survey was recently sent out. Please fill out the survey and consider pushing reminders to your districts.

Arian Horbovetz: I am now on the transportation and parking master plan stakeholder committee, so if anyone has any concerns that I should bring to that committee, please let me know.

Question: Is there a list somewhere of all the committees on campus where we have GSC representation?

Jon Powers: We are trying to figure out how to make a list of external GSC representation. Brandi will start to put something together, and we'll put a call out in Teams to make sure we correctly capture that information.

Jon Powers: We have a call scheduled March 22 at 10:30am with Dr. John Blackshear to discuss the Demonstrations, Vigils, and Peaceful Protests Policy. You should have all received an invitation, if you are interested in attending. We had an initial meeting with Page Hetzel, VP Communications. It was mostly an introduction, but she does intend to create a Communications Advisory Committee across the University, and when she does she will invite a GSC Rep to serve on that committee.

Sarah Siddiqui: I just sent a message to everyone on Teams which links to a message that has the EEC's broad findings. We have a 60% response rate, so please do take the survey if you have not yet. Four things stood out as far as broad recommendations: 1) Offer Teams trainings to all GSC members as part of onboarding, 2) Subcommittees need actionable SMART goals and some continuity regarding membership, 3) Consider process improvements so that everyone's voice can be heard, 4) The majority of people feel that the currently 3-hour monthly meeting duration is fine, with some suggestions like shortening agenda items or doing more subcommittee work during the full meeting.

Jon Powers: David Lanni has offered to give a tour of the SoN new education wing if anyone is interested. Have a great weekend!